

THE *Nation*

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 161

NEW YORK • SATURDAY • AUGUST 18, 1945

NUMBER 7

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 145

EDITORIALS

The New Asia 148

One World or None *by Freda Kirchwey* 149

ARTICLES

Negrin's Policy is Winning *by J. Alvarez Del Vayo* 150

Washington Faces Peace *by I. F. Stone* 151

The Trial of Pétain *by Pertinax* 152

When H. G. Wells Split the Atom:
A 1914 Preview of 1945 *by F. K.* 154

Progress in Yugoslavia *by Hal Lehrman* 156

In the Wind 157

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

Notes by the Way *by Margaret Marshall* 158

Poets of Republican Spain *by Rolfe Humphries* 159

Briefer Comment 159

Music *by B. H. Haggin* 163

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS 164

Editor and Publisher

FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor

J. KING GORDON

Washington Editor

I. F. STONE

Literary Editor

MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors: KEITH HUTCHISON • MAXWELL S. STEWART

ROBERT BENDINER [On leave with the army]

Editor Political War Section

J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Assistant Editor

J. MITCHELL MORSE

Music Critic

B. H. HAGGIN

Drama Critic

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager

HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager

MARY HOWARD ELLISON

Director of Nation Associates

LILLIE SHULTZ

Board of Contributing Editors

NORMAN ANGELL

JONATHAN DANIELS

CAREY MCWILLIAMS

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Published weekly and copyright, 1945, in the U. S. A. by The Nation Associates, Inc., 20 Vesey St., New York 7, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Washington Editorial Bureau: 318 Kellogg Building.

The Shape of Things

WE GO TO PRESS AT A MOMENT OF TENSION and confusion while Japan's formal answer to our surrender terms is breathlessly awaited. The Japanese offer of capitulation, coming on the heels of the atomic bomb and Russia's entrance into the Far Eastern war, stirred expectations of immediate peace. These culminated in wild celebrations after a mysterious report by the United Press that Japan had finally surrendered. The report itself is under investigation by the FBI and the FCC, and is just conceivably the work of a Japanese agent in an incident as fantastic as anything in the latest whodunit. But it is more probable that events in Japan delayed an answer to the Allied peace terms. In any case peace cannot be long postponed. The swift advance of the Soviet armies in Korea, Manchuria, and North China, on top of our terrific bombings, makes prolonged resistance unlikely, though a series of suicide and surprise attacks is possible. Whether by design or not, the surrender reports already represent a psychological set-back for us, and unless peace comes within the next few days it will be difficult to keep war workers at their task and to prevent a serious let-down in the armed forces.

✱

THE TERMS OF THE THREE-POWER DECLARATION to Japan before Russia's entrance into the war implied the continuance in power of the Emperor. Japan's surrender offer, while accepting the Potsdam-Cairo terms, asked an "explicit indication" that "the prerogatives of His Majesty as a sovereign ruler" would not be prejudiced. The Byrnes reply, on the behalf of the four powers, made no direct answer. The Emperor is to remain on the throne subject to the orders of the Allied military commander, but "the ultimate form" of the Japanese government is to be determined by "the freely expressed will of the Japanese people." There are advantages in using the Emperor to make peace and in leaving his future to the Japanese people. The danger is that if MacArthur is made Allied commander in Japan, with Under Secretary of State Grew and his former Counsellor of Embassy Eugene Dooman as political advisers, our military power may be used to keep the Emperor on the throne and to suppress popular movements against him. *The Nation's* recent revelations of the policies followed by MacArthur in the Philippines indicate what is to be expected from him in Japan.

✱

ONE OF THE FEW POINTS IN PRESIDENT Truman's broadcast not previously covered by the Big Three's report was his disclosure of an American proposal to place Europe's waterways under international control. It

seems probable that discussion of this question was inspired by Russian demands on Turkey for a revision of the Montreux Treaty so that its warships and merchant vessels will have an unobstructed passage from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean in peace or war. On American initiative this delicate issue has been broadened to cover all European water-routes in which more than one country has an interest. "Selfish control" of such routes, Mr. Truman said, "has been one of the persistent causes for war in Europe." He suggested that in future there should be free and unrestricted navigation of the Danube, the Black Sea Straits, the Rhine, the Kiel Canal, and all other waterways which border upon two or more states. Their development and regulation, he urged, should be intrusted to international agencies on which the United States, Britain, Russia and France should be represented as well as the riparian states. No definite action was taken on this proposal at Potsdam; it was referred to the new Council of Ministers, where the United States intends to press for its adoption. Certainly our representatives can find plenty of good arguments for the principle of curbing national monopolies of international traffic arteries. But would not their arguments be stronger if they recognized that the principle had universal, not merely European, validity; that it applied to the Suez and Panama canals as well as to the Dardanelles? *

THE PRESS SCREAMED "ESPIONAGE" WHEN The Six were arrested on State Department orders for disclosing "confidential" information on the Far East. But minor stories on the inside pages carried the news that a federal grand jury in the District of Columbia had refused to indict three of them and indicted the other three not for espionage but merely for "purloining" government documents. State Department hysteria and anxiety to silence critics of its Far Eastern policies have thus succeeded in smearing without cause John Stewart Service, one of its own foreign-service officials; Kate Mitchell, co-editor of *Amerasia*, and Mark Gayn, a free-lance writer on the Far East. No indictments were returned against them. At the same time the grand jury's action indicates that the stigma of "spy" was equally unjustified when applied to Andrew Roth, former lieutenant in the navy; Philip Jaffe, editor of *Amerasia*; and Emanuel Sigurd Larsen, another State Department employee. It remains to be seen how much can be proved against these three at their trial. It becomes clearer than ever that the case of The Six was an attempt by the Grew-Dooman crowd to discredit its opponents in the department and in the press by underhanded and dishonorable means. We demand Service's reinstatement with formal public apologies and again ask that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigate this whole shameful affair. *

WE HAVE HAD A THUNDEROUS REMINDER IN the past week of the lag between scientific invention and social thinking, but apparently it was not loud enough to awaken some of our Rip Van Winkles. Take, for instance, Herbert Hoover, who, six days after the first atomic bomb was dropped, made a speech about the "free American system" which would have seemed dated even when he was President. Mr. Hoover is alarmed about the spread of com-

munist and the fact that "half a dozen once liberty-loving nations are shifting to socialism," with Britain the most recent example. To him these foreign systems are forms of collectivist tyranny presided over by bullying bureaucrats, but, for all their unattractiveness, he fears the invasion of the Western Hemisphere by their propaganda. Therefore he calls upon us to defend "economic freedom," without which "all the freedoms of the mind and spirit will perish." We know, he continues, "that discovery, invention, competition, and skills can never come from government officials." This is a curious statement to make in the face of the terrific collective enterprise that made possible the splitting of the atom. True, the results of that enterprise have appalling potentialities for evil, but they also offer to mankind tremendous opportunities. Is it conceivable that these opportunities will be realized if the development of this revolutionary source of energy is left to private enterprise?

✱

AMERICAN MERCHANT SEAMEN, WHO BY THEIR courage and endurance have made so great a contribution to victory, "enjoy" a basic wage rate of only 34½ cents an hour—no more than before the war. For the men who have carried our soldiers and weapons to all parts of the world, risking their lives continuously, there has been not even the 15 per cent increase provided by the "Little Steel" formula. True, bonuses have been paid for duty in war zones which have sometimes made take-home pay at the end of a voyage double or treble the basic wage, but against this must be set such facts as the stoppage of a man's pay if his ship was sunk, as so many were. From the beginning, these additional payments have been treated by the ship operators as ample compensation for the increased cost of living. But now that European waters are no longer considered dangerous, bonuses are being reduced without reference to the price level. Today a seaman on Atlantic routes can expect to earn no more than \$125 a month, including all extras. Soon after V-J Day bonuses are likely to be wiped out altogether. The National Maritime Union, therefore, has asked the War Labor Board to approve an increase in wage rates to 55 cents an hour—the minimum established for all other American workers. There should be no hesitation on the board's part in complying with this demand. The union has steadfastly kept its pledge against war-time strikes; it intends to do all it can to speed the job of bringing the troops home. But low wages are encouraging individual seamen to leave the merchant service in droves—8,000 a month on the average—and it is increasingly difficult to man the ships.

✱

CIVIL WAR IS THE "ONLY SOLUTION" TO THE present situation in Argentina, according to dictator Perón himself. This extraordinary statement seems to be the regime's answer to the growing opposition of democratic forces. In an interview with Dr. Pedro Cué, director of the Cuban daily, *El Mundo*, Perón said: "I do not fear civil war because I am prepared for it. . . . I have at my disposal 300,000 soldiers and 4,000,000 workers armed with clubs." Shortly after this interview, free elections and the lifting of the state of siege were announced. But no people was ever

freed by a tyrant's edict and these apparently conciliatory gestures are in truth a Perónian provocation to internal strife. Argentina's major political parties, the Socialists, Radicals, and Conservatives, representing all shades of opinion from left to right, view as an immediate threat the amended political-parties statute which became effective on August 1. For it enables government-appointed commissions to convoke and control the national assemblies of political parties which, dissolved since 1943, are now permitted to function again. According to the statute present party leaders must be dropped and new ones chosen under the aegis of committees named by federal electoral courts appointed by the present fascist government. The moderate Radical Party, Argentina's most powerful political organization, is in immediate danger of being captured and used by the Perón clique to support the dictatorship's candidate for President, who may turn out to be Perón himself. Thus the promise of free elections is coupled with the imposition of measures that make free elections impossible. Perón has presented the Argentines with the alternatives of giving his detested regime a vote of confidence or fighting in the streets. The spontaneous pro-democratic rally of 15,000 Argentines in Buenos Aires last week, which led to rioting and demonstrations against Perón when the police attempted to intervene, show what their answer is likely to be.

✱

PIETY AND PURITANISM ARE OLD PARTNERS, and they are intimately linked with political reaction. In Spain the triumvirate is very busy these days. Within recent weeks Rome has sent instructions to the Spanish hierarchy to intensify its campaign against the reestablishment of the republic. And simultaneously the church is trying to turn Spain back to the dark days of the nineteenth century when friars and nuns dominated the court and dictated the laws of the country. The Archbishop of Valencia, the Most Reverend Prudencio Melo, has recently issued a pastoral letter laying down for Spanish parents severe instructions, supported by the government and heralded by the press department of the Falange. Parents are warned "not to allow their daughters to wear décolleté dress that would reveal too much of their figures, or to leave uncovered the greatest part of the legs." The letter deals firmly with the problem of picnics and parties; parents must make sure that their daughters take no part in excursions with men, "especially if the excursion is by bicycle." Archbishop Melo does not explain the clerical opposition to the bicycle, but presumably it arises from the danger that in pedaling the "greatest part of the leg" will be exposed. Unmarried men and women are not to be allowed to bathe from the same beach unless there are "separate sections for each sex." Especially strong censure is directed against the custom of "engaged couples" walking hand-in-hand in the street. Cinemas should not be frequented unless the films have been expressly approved by the ecclesiastical censorship. The Archbishop is convinced that only by such measures as these, and by the maintenance of the fascist regime, can Spain be saved from the moral ruin that threatens Europe.

✱

THE NATION ENTHUSIASTICALLY INDORSES THE proposal by the National Lawyers Guild for the appointment

of William H. Hastie to the judicial post left vacant by the resignation of Thurman W. Arnold from the Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia. As judge of the District Court for the Virgin Islands from 1937 to 1939, Mr. Hastie was the first Negro to sit on the federal bench and would be the first of his race on the Circuit Court of Appeals. But *The Nation* supports him for the vacant judgeship not merely out of a desire to give recognition to the Negro, but because it believes Mr. Hastie well qualified for this position by training, legal accomplishment, and social outlook. The dean of the Howard University Law School is not only a lawyer of distinguished professional attainments but a man of consistently progressive views and courageous temperament. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals is in some respects the most influential appeals court in the country and its decisions play a role second only to that of the United States Supreme Court in molding American law. It is important that the judges on this court, in the crucial post-war years, should be men of liberal philosophy and instinctive sympathy with the underprivileged. We know of no one who fills those requirements better than Dean Hastie.

✱

THE NAME OF THE UNITED NATIONS WILL BE A mockery in Europe unless more help is quickly provided, Herbert Lehman said last week. He pointed out that up to the close of June UNRRA had not received many officially allocated foodstuffs urgently needed overseas. In this connection an item in *Le Figaro* of July 27 has special interest. Under the heading "American Troops Burn Material and Food They Cannot Take With Them," it tells the story of what happened at the Villaroche camp, where large quantities of more or less used linen, preserves, fats, etc., were thrown into a huge fire. "Inhabitants of nearby villages who had salvaged foodstuffs and other articles spared by the flames were surprised to have these things confiscated and burned." In another camp bundles of clothing, slightly used, were cut to pieces and then sold to a rag merchant. *Figaro* philosophically comments that if Allied military authorities 'are afraid of supplying the black market by disposing of certain items, they could, with the help of local authorities, supervise their distribution. In any case it would be highly unfortunate to continue to offer to people without anything the spectacle of such wanton waste.' This puts the case much too mildly. Any waste by our army in Europe is scandalous at this time, and we look to the Commander-in-Chief to give stringent orders to prevent a recurrence of such incidents. The soldiers would appreciate it too; the *New York Times* reports that they carried out their orders with visible repugnance.

✱

IN A REPORT TO CONGRESS ISSUED JUST BEFORE he left Washington Mr. Morgenthau made some suggestions about the federal budget which deserve careful consideration. "To me," he said, "the outstanding weakness in the management in federal fiscal business is the absence of a single, responsible officer to whom the President may look for complete and comprehensive policy direction over the entire field of borrowing, lending, spending, and insuring. . . . In actual practice the area of control and influence exercised by

the Secretary of the Treasury is largely limited to one side of the ledger. He is not in a position to exert proper influence over the use and disposition of the funds he must raise and account for to the nation." At present fiscal planning is diffused both at the administrative and the legislative level. The budget is prepared by the Budget Bureau, which is directly responsible to the President, while detailed suggestions for raising the money required are submitted to Congress by the Treasury. On Capitol Hill four committees—Ways and Means and Appropriations in the House, Finance and Appropriations in the Senate—consider separately national financial policy. Thus at no point is the budget reviewed as a whole and in relation to its total effect on the national economy. Mr. Morgenthau wishes to see the Budget Bureau brought under the Treasury. He also suggests the establishment of a National Committee for Fiscal Affairs, with the Secretary of the Treasury as chairman, and representatives of eight subcommittees covering (1) industrial finance; (2) agricultural finance; (3) foreign finance; (4) maritime finance; (5) money and credit; (6) housing finance; (7) public works finance; (8) federal budget. It seems probable that this program will commend itself to Secretary Vinson. Post-war fiscal problems are going to be extraordinarily hard to handle in any circumstances. A complete overhauling of the machinery should be undertaken immediately. Congress re-assembles in September.

The New Asia

WITH the surrender of Japan, new and incalculable political forces have been unleashed which will affect the destiny of all nations bordering the Pacific. For more than a generation the shadow of a militaristic, power-loving Japan has hung over Asia. Ambitious young men from China, Burma, India, and other parts of the East have flocked to Japanese universities and accepted Japan's doctrine of force as Asia's answer to the West's technical superiority. Hundreds of millions of people in Korea, Manchuria, and Southeast Asia have passively bowed before Japanese power because there seemed to be no hope of liberation. Now that this malignant power has been destroyed by the United Nations, we may anticipate rapid and profound changes throughout the Pacific area.

Of greatest concern to us will be the effect of the defeat on the Japanese themselves. No one really knows today just what their reaction will be. Will they turn against the political and business leaders who led them to disaster? Or will they sullenly accept Allied dictation while plotting revenge? Much depends on the kind of peace that is imposed on Japan. The Potsdam surrender terms are too general to give us much of a clue. The Allied governments face an extraordinarily delicate task in seeking to eliminate the industrial basis of Japan's military power without destroying the source of livelihood of millions of Japanese families. Their ability to find a solution to this problem will hinge largely on who is to be permitted to control Japan's remaining industry. Will the *Zaibatsu*, whose close link with the militarists was shown in a recent article in *The Nation* by Laurence Salisbury, be allowed to retain their stranglehold over Japanese

economy? Or will the United Nations encourage the creation of a popular government which will control the country's major industrial resources? Had the Japanese surrender come a week earlier, the chances are that the Grew-Dooman policy of cooperating with the *Zaibatsu* would have prevailed. But Russia's entry into the war may tip the scales the other way. Judged by its attitude in Germany, Russia can be expected to favor the development of trade unions and anti-fascist political parties in the Japanese territory it will doubtless occupy. As in Germany, the Americans will probably have to follow suit. If the Japanese people are helped to escape from the domination of their industrial and agricultural overlords, they may themselves get rid of the Emperor and the feudal heritage which the militarists used so successfully in promoting the war.

Korea will undoubtedly present many problems. The Cairo Declaration guarantees Korea's ultimate independence, but difficulties may crop up in arranging an interim government. Korea is one of the few countries in Asia in which the Communists are strong. In the absence of any other important political group, the Korean Communists might readily seize power, especially if the occupying force were Russian. Just how Washington would react to such a development is not clear. A definite five-power understanding on Korea's future is urgently needed to prevent a conflict between Russia and the United States.

With the end of the war, the future of China hinges more than ever on the outcome of the talks which have been going on in Moscow between Premier T. V. Soong and Marshal Stalin. Professional Russia-haters have been busy painting a frightening picture of Russia's intentions in the Far East. The Soviet Union is supposed to be planning to swallow the whole of Manchuria, Mongolia, and large sections of China proper. But reports so far available on the Soong-Stalin negotiations provide no basis for such allegations. It is true that Russia has important interests in Manchuria. Having occupied this region, the Russians would undoubtedly be reluctant to hand it over to an unfriendly Chinese regime. China and Russia also have conflicting interests in Outer Mongolia and Singkiang. But if the reports coming from Chungking and Moscow on the Soong-Stalin talks are to be trusted, these problems are in process of being solved. China is said to be willing to grant Russia transit rights to Vladivostok across Manchuria, as it did before the Japanese conquest, together with a warm-water naval base on the Liaotung Peninsula. China is also probably prepared to accept Russian influence in Singkiang and to recognize the independence of Outer Mongolia in return for specific Russian guaranties regarding Chinese sovereignty in Manchuria. While minor territorial adjustments may be made to protect Vladivostok, there is no hint of extensive territorial demands.

But a final political settlement between China and Russia will be impossible until the long-standing feud between Chungking and Yenan is ended. The Japanese surrender has created a new crisis which may result in a bloody conflict. Doubtless this is what Japan has been hoping for, and Chiang Kai-shek is playing into its hands by his present tactics. He forbade the Chinese Eighth Army to continue disarming Japanese soldiers and then warned the Japanese that they would be held "accountable" if they gave up their arms

to the Chinese Communists. But a Chungking attack on Yen-an would probably bring Russia to the aid of the left-wing Yen-an regime. Should this happen, the United States would be placed in a difficult position, particularly in view of the Grew-Hurley policy of supporting Chungking. It is reported that American military equipment has already been used against the Communists by Chiang Kai-shek's forces.

Chiang's attitude parallels that of certain circles in our own State and War departments which were opposed to Russian participation in the Far Eastern war and have been hoping for peace with Japan before the Soviet armies establish themselves too strongly in Manchuria and Korea. What is now needed is closer liaison with the Russians, swift measures to end the Chungking-Yenan tension, and new men and policies in dealing with the problem of post-war Japan.

One World or None

BY FRED A. KIRCHWEY

THE bomb that hurried Russia into the Far Eastern war a week ahead of schedule and drove Japan to surrender has accomplished the specific job for which it was created. From the point of view of military strategy, \$2,000,000,000 (the cost of the bomb and the cost of nine days of war) was never better spent. The suffering, the wholesale slaughter it entailed, have been outweighed by its spectacular success; Allied leaders can rightly claim that the loss of life on both sides would have been many times greater if the atomic bomb had not been used and Japan had gone on fighting. There is no answer to this argument. The danger is that it will encourage those in power to assume that, once accepted as valid, the argument can be applied equally well in the future. If that assumption should be permitted, the chance of saving civilization—and perhaps the world itself—from destruction is a remote one.

Solemn official talk is going on in Britain and here about controlling the use of the new force. But the talk is unconvincing. The atomic bomb represents a revolution in science—the greatest revolution ever accomplished. It calls for a comparable revolution in men's thinking and in their capacity for political and social readjustment. Not a hint of that has so far emerged in high places, either here or in Britain. And so far no leader of one of the lesser states, from which the new knowledge has been withheld, has presumed to open his mouth. No one has spoken the simple truth that the exploding atom has exposed to the whole world.

President Truman announced that he would recommend to Congress "the establishment of an appropriate commission to control the production and use of atomic power within the United States." He has promised that the secret of the bomb will be kept by the three nations that hold it until "means have been found to control the bomb so as to protect ourselves and the rest of the world from the danger of total destruction." Secretary Stimson says that "substantial patent rights" have been assured to the American, Canadian, and British governments to prevent independent exploitation of

the discovery. Do these plans and promises mean anything? Or are they conventional, official, high-sounding nonsense?

First, if anything is sure about the atomic bomb it is that no physical protection against it will ever be possible. The bomb dropped on Nagasaki was far more advanced than that dropped two days earlier on Hiroshima. Both were crude beginnings. We have already been promised that their successors will be enormously improved. Soon they will be propelled by rockets—similar to Hitler's V-2s—and directed exactly to their destination by radar. When this is achieved, not only will armies and fleets and island bases and strategic frontiers all have been made obsolete, but widespread annihilation can be accomplished by any power, or even group of men, that can command atomic energy.

And that leads to the absurdity of an attempt to limit control of this force to the nations that now hold it. President Truman is whistling to keep our courage up. He knows that other nations are working on atomic explosives. Before its defeat Germany was on the edge of success. Sweden and Denmark are carrying out intensive experimentation. It is not likely that Russia—which knows how to keep a secret better than any other country—has lagged behind the rest. Are we to be asked to believe that the Anglo-Saxon peoples have alone been granted the god-like power to crack atoms? The secret was guarded long enough to enable us to smash Japan. It will not last much longer. The present "trustees" of this force had better stop thinking in terms of control by themselves and begin to figure how a world is to be run in which every nation equipped for research and modern production will soon be able to make and propel atomic bombs.

So what sense is there in setting up an American commission "to control the production of atomic power"? Perhaps a little. Already certain private interests in this country have let it be known that, while they recognize the government's present right to monopolize the manufacture of atomic bombs, they are not prepared to accept government control over future use of the new energy. And Secretary Stimson's phrase, "substantial patent rights," is at best equivocal. It suggests that certain less substantial but perhaps highly valuable patents may already be in the hands of Du Pont or General Electric. And so a commission may be of some value, at least as an interim safeguard. But it will be well for us to remind Congress that the men it appoints will be dealing with a source of power discovered through the expenditure of \$2,000,000,000 of public money—taxpayers' money. That power belongs to the people if no other ever did.

Suppose the United States, Canada, and Britain attempt, as they seem prepared to do, to corner the knowledge of atomic power even for a brief period. What will be the effect of this monopoly? First, it will convert the three Anglo-Saxon nations into a monstrous threat to the rest of the world. Are other countries likely to accept with equanimity the fact that we and the British hold the secret of total destruction? Who but ourselves is going to trust us with such fantastic power? It would be healthy if Americans, just for a moment, would put themselves in the position of, let's say, the Russians or the Chinese, and try to see what this "democratic trusteeship" looks like from the vantage-point of Moscow or Chungking. No nation shut out from our closely guarded knowledge can possibly do other than speed

up its own collective effort to gain the same ground. The policy announced by the President is power politics raised to a cosmic degree; if continued it will insure an era of desperate competition in destruction, which can have only one outcome.

Atomic energy should no more be controlled by a few sovereign nations than it should be by a few private companies. "Free enterprise" for nations has been wiped out by the discovery. When President Truman went to the microphone to explain the agreement reached at Potsdam, the first atomic bomb had already exploded. So he discussed the Potsdam arrangements side by side with his proposal for controlling atomic energy. The fantastic incompatibility of the two items apparently did not strike him. But it is clear as water that no collective arrangements can stand in the face of the power held by America and Britain. Even the modest, halfway security measures adopted at San Francisco and written into the United Nations Charter can hardly be expected to survive such a situation. At the very minimum, the United Nations must be made trustee of the atomic bomb. Otherwise the idea of collective agreements to keep the peace may as well be abandoned.

But this minimum is far too small to provide any serious measure of safety. For the San Francisco charter is itself a collective agreement based on power. As Edward R. Murrow said the other day, the big nations have "created an organization and made laws from which they are exempt." In other words, there is no rule of law to which all nations are equally subject. The authority of the United Nations rests in the coalition of great powers which form its core. How much value can such an organization now have even if the control of the atomic bomb should be vested in it? It cannot dominate the world, for a single nation, small or large, possessed of the facilities to make the new explosive, would have as much power to threaten peace and terrorize other nations as one or all of the Big Three—or Four—or Five. And any one of the large nations, ruled by a new Hitler, could reduce the world to slavery—or to dust. In the space of a day the World Security Organization grew from childhood to senility. Now it must be replaced.

If we are to survive our new powers we must understand their full meaning. We shall have to move fast, both internationally and within each country. No longer can we afford a world organized to prevent aggression only if all of the great powers wish it to be prevented. No longer can we afford a social system which would permit private business, in the name of freedom, to control a source of energy capable of creating comfort and security for all the world's people. This seems self-evident, and so it is. But it calls for changes so sweeping that only an immense effort of will and imagination can bring them about. A new conference of the nations must be assembled to set up a World Government, to which every state must surrender an important part of its sovereignty. In this World Government must be vested the final control over atomic energy. And within each nation the people must establish public ownership and social development of the revolutionary force war has thrust into their hands. This program will sound drastic only to people who have not yet grasped the meaning of the new discovery. It is not drastic. We face a choice between one world or none.

Negrín's Policy is Winning

BY J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Mexico City, August 12

ON WEDNESDAY, August 8, the long-desired agreement between the Spanish Republican parties and organizations in Mexico was finally reached. Republican leaders agreed on a procedure which will make all the institutions of the Republic operative in exile. Having joined with Dr. Negrín in virtually all the discussions of the past three weeks, I know what skill and patience were required to bring the factions together; and in the two meetings held last week, Dr. Negrín surpassed his own previous record of successful conciliation.

The first meeting of the representatives of the parties took place on Tuesday. Twenty-six parties and organizations were represented, exactly the number of all the political groups in Mexico. A sensational fact was the participation of two representatives of the Prieto faction, Otero and Albar. The meeting was called on twenty-four hours' notice under the pressure of the news from Spain itself, indicating that Franco might replace himself with a new military government created in his own image. When word of the meeting leaked out to the Spanish colony, the general comment was, "Negrín has accomplished what nobody else has been able to do in six years." The same view, in almost identical language, was expressed the following day by Martínez Barrio when a formal agreement was confirmed and signed in the presence of Dr. Negrín.

Under this agreement a meeting of the Cortes is to be called to formalize the parties' choice of a provisional President of the Republic, in the person of Martínez Barrio. This will make it possible for the present government to submit its resignation and a new government to be named in accordance with the constitutional procedure.

Only two groups failed to sign the agreement. These were the Socialist fraction gathered around Prieto and a small fraction of the syndicalist organization, the C. N. T. Four sections of the latter organization did sign. The representatives of the Prieto group failed to appear at the meeting of August 8 but sent instead a letter in which they raise three points: First, they doubted that there was such urgency as Negrín claimed for reaching an agreement in twenty-four hours. Second, they challenged the right of some of the groups invited by Negrín to participate, to demand recognition as regular political organizations. Third, they opposed any solution not based on the sanction and participation of the Cortes.

The first objection is not shared by other Spaniards here or in Spain. On the contrary, everyone has been counting not the days but the moments until an agreement could be reached. The second objection has an ironical flavor, for the Prieto group, organized in Mexico at the instigation of Prieto, is only a dissident fraction of the Spanish Socialist Party which has put itself outside the control of the party

executive elected in Spain. The third objection, the only substantial one, has been met by the agreement signed by the other parties: the Cortes will assemble and elect a President. It should be emphasized that at no time did Dr. Negrín favor a solution which would exclude the Cortes. What he wanted was conservation of time, with the understanding that whatever agreement was reached among the parties should be subject to final ratification by Parliament. If the Prieto group is logical, it must inevitably participate in the coming meeting of the Cortes. And it is reasonable to expect that it will do so.

The Cortes probably will meet this Thursday. The session will be limited in its functions. Its sole purpose is to formalize the installation of Martínez Barrio as President of the Cortes and, therefore, as acting President of the Spanish Republic. It will then adjourn. Immediately thereafter Dr. Negrín will hand the provisional President his own resigna-

tion and that of his Cabinet, and the President will request one of the party leaders to form a government.

Speculation is rife, of course, as to the composition of the new Cabinet. To the majority of Republicans only one person is capable of steering the Republic through the difficult days which lie ahead. The statesmanship shown here by Dr. Negrín offers further assurance that he is the man most capable of heading the government. Dr. Negrín himself has adopted the most austere attitude toward the succession. He has declined all undertakings designed to honor him on his success in reaching an agreement and has refused all engagements that could be interpreted as capitalizing on his immediate achievement and old-time popularity. He came to Mexico for a single purpose—to unite the Republicans, to give them a President, and thus to make possible a legally reorganized government as an effective instrument of action within and without Spain. His accomplishments are already historic fact.

Washington Faces Peace

BY I. F. STONE

Washington, August 10

BY THE time these lines appear in print the war will almost certainly be over. The prospect of sudden victory has created anxiety here as well as jubilation. For with the coming of peace, the classic crutch of war is kicked out from under American capitalism. The United States faces not only the same old problem but the same old problem in a more intense and exacerbated form. We emerge from the war the Midas of nations. While other countries rise from the ruins appalled by their poverty, we are baffled by our wealth. Our power to produce has increased by 50 per cent since 1940, and the task of raising living standards to match that output is of such magnitude that only government, and business men willing to cooperate with government, can accomplish it. A glimpse of what lies ahead is provided by "Post-War Markets" (Public Affairs Press, Washington), a business guide based on official information prepared by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. If post-war output should be no greater than it was in 1940 (when our economy was already stimulated by war orders) "there would be the 9,000,000 who were unemployed in 1940 plus the 2,500,000 added to the civilian labor force between 1940 and 1946 plus 8,000,000 who would be displaced by improvements in efficiency over the six years—a total of over 19,000,000 unemployed."

The figures are terrifying, but the only hope of arousing sufficient public pressure and Congressional concern is to step up such statistical bombardment. The lag between technological capacity and social organization is an old story, but the dimensions of that lag have nowhere and never before been so great as in the United States of 1945. The Mead committee, in its new report on reconversion problems, estimates that we must find 11,000,000 more jobs than in 1929, which is 6,000,000 more than our present civilian labor force.

But employment in manufacturing industries last year was already 5,000,000 greater than in 1929 or 1939. "We must not only hold these productive gains," the Mead committee says, "but we must find productive work for 6,000,000 additional persons." Without strong countervailing pressure, the drift will be toward resumption of business on pre-war levels, with the government providing made-work for the jobless. The danger is made graphic by a War Production Board survey cited by the Mead committee. In seventy-two industries, the "break-even operating rate" would be reached at a point where employment would be 25 per cent less than at present. Large sections of business could operate profitably enough for the owners on considerably less than capacity production. And no doubt many would prefer that to "government interference."

In a sardonic sense, the sudden surrender of Japan may well be regarded as its reprisal for atomic bombing. We were poorly enough prepared for a slow and comfortable period in which we could devote half our energies to the war in the Pacific and half to the resumption of large-scale civilian output. We are completely unprepared for a Japanese collapse, and unless we act quickly and wisely may face an economic collapse ourselves. The President's letter last night to Chairman J. A. Krug of the War Production Board has already been overtaken by events. There is immediate need for a program which will smooth the transition from war to peace, and a longer-range, if hardly less urgent, need for a program which will insure that industry reconverts to a full-employment level. No government agency has been authorized to tackle the second job, though some headway is being made in Congress by the full-employment bill. But even the simpler and more immediate task of reconversion has yet to be mapped out adequately. Mr. Krug, an ex-TVA man with an N. A. M. mind, believes that the problem can be met by

hoopla; he would remove all restrictions as rapidly as possible and let industry scramble back to civilian output pretty much on a hit-or-miss basis. The OPA, the War Labor Board, and the Office of Economic Stabilization feel that controls must be retained and used during the transitional period if it is to be negotiated successfully.

Mr. Truman, whose Senatorial experience made him conversant with the problems of industrial mobilization for war and peace, had to decide between these two points of view, and his letter is a victory for those who fear too quick a removal of restrictions. But unfortunately it leaves Krug and the WPB crowd at the controls, and they are already interpreting the President's letter to suit themselves. The WPB is as much big-business as ever and cannot be trusted to handle reconversion on a basis fair to the smaller business man and the consumer. The big fellows would like to grab

off materials quickly at the expense of the smaller. There is quick profit to be made in turning swiftly to production of higher-price items. The health of business enterprise requires a fair distribution of scarce materials during the transition, and the welfare of the consumer requires the allocation and channelling of materials into badly needed low-cost goods. The nation's economic safety depends on continued price controls during the transition and planning on an unprecedented scale for a higher level of output.

All this is repugnant to the WPB crowd, and Mr. Truman should know from past experience that it will handle these problems its own sweet way, irrespective of White-House directives. New agencies, new men, new ideas, new directions are necessary—and quickly—if we are not to suffer a relapse into chronic mass unemployment now that war's blood transfusions will no longer be available to an ailing capitalism.

The Trial of Pétain

BY PERTINAX

[Pertinax, greatest of European diplomatic correspondents, is the author of "The Gravediggers of France." He is now living in Washington.]

THE double charge brought against Pétain is that he was in intelligence with the enemy and attacked the safety of the state, i.e., overthrew republican institutions. I have been investigating the doings of Pétain for five years and I don't doubt that those two main charges can be substantiated. But Pétain did not go to Berlin to cash a sum of money and he was not caught with a load of dynamite in the vaults of the French Parliament. The story is a complex one and there is need of an energetic hand to pick up all the threads. Moreover, the crime of high treason is perhaps more narrowly defined in French law than in English law. At any rate, in the unprecedented circumstances of 1940, high treason took a form of which no French legislator had ever dreamed. For that reason, the task which devolves upon the public prosecutor, an onerous one anyhow, calls for great legal ingenuity. The prosecutor must translate into the terms of an out-of-date penal code Pétain's numberless faults of omission and commission which, but for the resistance of England, for the mighty intervention of Russia and the United States of America, would have led to the final subjugation of France.

To succeed in that endeavor, an intimate knowledge of the political happenings in France and in Europe during the last ten years is needed. I can hardly bring myself to believe that Public Prosecutor André Mornet lays any claim to this knowledge. His selection of witnesses, his haphazard way of cross-examining them, the free rein left for so many irrelevant speeches feed a suspicion that he does not know for sure what he is seeking to prove and to disprove. He is casting his net right and left in the hope that somehow he will make a catch. "Justice is a fight," a French philosopher once wrote. Prosecutor Mornet has not properly planned his

action. Mornet, as a prosecutor, shone on that level of treasonable offenses associated with the name of Mata-Hari, the Javanese dancing girl. But in a discussion which bears fundamentally on the implications of perhaps the greatest political drama of all time M. Mornet is out of his depth. And for that matter, the same remark may apply to Presiding Judge Mongibeaux.

From the start, Mornet's business was to discover the line of advance along which the prosecution could turn, with a minimum effort, the obstacles interposed by the defense. It is in relation to the fate of the French fleet in June, 1940, that the deadly responsibilities of Pétain can probably be put in the strongest possible relief. That in June, 1940, the French army could not continue to battle on metropolitan soil, nobody ever denied. That to go on with the war in North Africa was a doubtful venture may be argued not very convincingly but perhaps with a veneer of plausibility. However, for not ordering the French fleet, a considerable force, to join the British fleet, even before the request for an armistice was forwarded to Berlin via Madrid, what sort of excuse can be found? None whatever, except the terrible delusion that by imperiling England and the cause of freedom all over the world a strong bid could be made for the favor of Hitler and that Hitler's favor might redeem France out of the abyss. Today we are aware that the fate of the civilized world hung in 1940-1941 on the narrow margin of a few cruisers. Pétain created the terrible odds which British naval power had to face.

An explanation of his obstinate refusal to part with the fleet before the armistice is only to be found in the stupid belief that the French state, once an alliance with Hitler had been cemented, could be rebuilt on the foundations of the old monarchy. The officials who saw Pétain at close quarters, in the summer and the autumn of 1940, bear witness to his deep sense of contentment and gratification. This certainty was his—that he would go down to posterity as the successful

reformer of the French state, as the exorcist who had driven out of French hearts the revolutionary spirit. When Paul Baudouin told him, one fine morning, that the Duc de Guise, the head of the house of Bourbon-Orleans, was dead, he exclaimed: "Then, it will fall to the Count of Paris to succeed me."

Such are the central facts in the record of Pétain. All other charges must be held additional to that count. To outward appearances, Mornet does not grasp it firmly enough.

All pleas for Pétain necessarily revolve on two main themes. In the first place, Laval was the evil genius of his regime and many objectionable steps with which Pétain is reproached must be ascribed to Laval. Then, on the whole, the policy of Pétain was dictated by the necessity to convince the Germans that he was on their side. In short, the defense of Pétain is that he played a double game, that he longed, through it all, for an American if not for a British victory. To refute that argument does not call for superhuman exertions. But, here again, no prosecutor can cut any ice unless he has solved for himself the psychological problem of Pétain. Mornet, so far, has not given any hint that he understands the terms of that problem.

In the Pétain-Laval marriage, Laval was the male and Pétain was the female. Pétain came to hate Laval as early as the summer of 1940, but, had not Laval held all government controls, Pétain's rule would never have been set up. This must be added: but for the moral indorsement he got from Pétain as early as the spring of 1934, Laval would never have had a chance to assert his power. Following on the dismissal of Laval (December 13, 1940) did the policy of collaboration with Germany show any change? Hardly. From Vichy officials who seem to have retained some independence of judgment we hear that Darlan, with the unstinted support of Pétain, proved as daring as his predecessor. As to Pétain's supposedly concealed intention to prepare for an Anglo-American victory, the following point deserves to be stressed. All the defeated generals of 1940, all the supporters of the armistice and collaborationist policy, all the officials willingly or unwillingly harnessed to the Vichy dictatorship, all the men who had to swear loyalty to the head of the state or part with their livelihood, have no choice today but to proclaim loudly that Pétain, behind the screen of his official deeds and words, behaved as an artisan of Allied victory. They must stand by that thesis or implicitly confess that they stood for a Nazified Europe and be shamed.

To rebut their interpretation of the working of Pétain's mind, many witnesses are available. To this day, Mornet has failed to bring them in. To my direct knowledge, a French ambassador in active service had an opportunity to ascertain the whole outlook of Pétain in the winter of 1940. The old fellow was convinced that Germany could not fail to win the war. Speaking of the appointment of Admiral Leahy to the American embassy in Vichy, Pétain said: "I see very well where President Roosevelt intends to lead me. He will not make me swerve an inch from my policy." When Gaston Henry-Haye, Pétain's Ambassador to the United States, arrived in New York in the autumn of 1940, his first words to Jacques Truelle, the French Chargé d'Affaires who received him at the LaGuardia airfield, were: "It is high time for the Americans to understand that France and England

took the initiative in attacking Germany." Henry-Haye, a servile man, carried out, in his clumsy manner, the instructions received from Pétain two or three days before. What did such words mean if not that German victory had to be wholeheartedly accepted?

The logical process is inexorable. Pétain took the German triumph for granted. He therefore followed a course which was bound to draw upon him the reprisals of French patriots if the Allies, in the end, had the better of the fight. Consequently, at the bottom of his heart, he could not but dread a reversal of Hitler's military fortune: everything points to that cerebral itinerary of Pétain. For lack of space, I leave aside the North African episode in November, 1942. But this can be said. The military leader who was closeted with Darlan in the fateful hours and days when Darlan reached his great decision has heard of some cryptic messages sent to the Admiral by naval officers in Vichy, in which the men who wanted to join hands with the Americans could read some halting encouragement. But that military leader does not say that those cryptic messages reflected the personal attitude of Pétain. And certain strange moves made by Darlan give food for thought. Why was that confidant of Darlan left outside the trial? Mornet is baffled at every turn by the tangled skein.

The other day, Laval, banking on the ignorance of the judges and the public, boasted of having concluded a military treaty with Mussolini in 1935. Military treaty there was none, but a military protocol was indeed offered to Laval by Mussolini for the definite purpose of enlisting Laval's and Gamelin's good-will and assistance on the eve of the aggression against Ethiopia. Nothing could come of that protocol anyhow, as long as Italo-Yugoslav problems had not been solved, and Mussolini did not want those problems to be solved until Prince Regent Paul had renounced the friendship of France. Mornet had never heard of the incident. He did not rebuke Laval. This is one example among many.

Because of the helplessness of the prosecutor, the Prime Ministers of the 1936-1940 period, Léon Blum, Edouard Daladier, and Paul Reynaud figured in the proceedings more prominently than was fitting and desirable. Against Pétain they became the protagonists of the prosecution. Of Léon Blum it can only be said that he behaved as he always does—with a deep sense of his own dignity, with perfect reverence for truth. But Daladier and Reynaud had axes to grind. Reynaud, particularly, made the most of the opportunity at hand. His preoccupation was not to enlighten judges and jury about Pétain but to explain away his own grievous failings in 1940. With Reynaud on the stand the trial became a wrangle between France's gravediggers. The account given by Reynaud of his appointment to the Washington embassy in June, 1940, sets very low the degree of credence he deserves to be given.

As the result of those loosely conducted proceedings, the guilt of Pétain may remain a controversial issue for an active minority. It was not to be expected that this active minority would ever disarm. But, however flimsy the ammunition to be gathered in the trial for use against the French Republic of tomorrow, even this slender advantage ought to have been denied to the disciples of Charles Maurras (who packed the court on the first day) and to the zealots of social conservation.

When H. G. Wells Split the Atom

A 1914 Preview of 1945

OF COURSE it was H. G. Wells who first perfected the atomic bomb and put it to work. And not only did he put it to work, demolishing most of the world's capital cities and destroying governments, but then he got busy and built an entirely new society. In less time than you can imagine after the last bomb fell, everybody was settling down nicely in a global socialist community under a World Republic; atomic energy, internationally controlled, was performing all the necessary jobs of production, transportation, heating, and such, and the creative energies of mankind were being applied to higher things. In 1914, when "The World Set Free" * was published and no bombs of any sort had been dropped it all sounded fantastic and even funny.

Mr. Wells's first atomic bomb dropped during the final war between the Allies and the Central European powers. Hostilities started, dramatically enough, with an air attack on the headquarters in Paris of the Allied High Command. It demolished the War Control Board, and you might have thought that would have put an end to the fighting. But not at all. What it did was to encourage the "rather brutish young aviator with the bullet head," who was in charge of the French special scientific corps, to go ahead and run the war the way he wanted to. He was pleased to have the War Control out of the way.

He slapped his second-in-command on the shoulder. "Now," he said, "there's nothing on earth to stop us going to Berlin and giving them tit-for-tat. . . . Strategy and reasons of state—they're over. . . . Come along, my boy, and we'll just show these old women what we can do when they let us have our heads." . . . He looked at the sky and noted with satisfaction a heavy bank of clouds athwart the pallid east.

He was a young man of infinite shrewdness, and his material and airplanes were scattered all over the countryside, stuck away in barns, covered with hay, hidden in woods. . . . But that night he only wanted one of the machines, and it was handy and quite prepared under a tarpaulin between two ricks not a couple of miles away; he was going to Berlin with that and just one other man. . . . He had in his hands the black complement to all those other gifts science was urging upon unregenerate mankind, the gift of destruction, and he was an adventurous rather than a sympathetic type. . . .

Presently the airplane, which was a model far in advance of those recently sent over Japan for it had a noiseless atomic engine, flew across Westphalia and Saxony toward Berlin. The young aviator was at the controls. His face "had something of that firm beauty which all concentrated purpose gives, and something of the happiness of an idiot child that has at last got hold of the matches."

His companion, a less imaginative type, sat with his legs spread wide over the long, coffin-shaped box which

contained in its compartments the three atomic bombs, the new bombs that would continue to explode indefinitely and which no one so far had ever seen in action. Hitherto carolinum, their essential substance, had been tested only in almost infinitesimal quantities within steel chambers imbedded in lead.

It wasn't until he had passed Potsdam and was approaching the palace and the government buildings that he was attacked by a German plane which "slanted down like a sword swung by a lazy man" and then began to shoot. The French plane had no bomb-sight, it seems, but the pilot was flying low enough to see his objectives. The bombardier was ready.

The gaunt face hardened to grimness, and with both hands [he] lifted the big atomic bomb from the box and steadied it against the side. It was a black sphere, two feet in diameter. Between its handles was a little celluloid stud, and to this he bent his head until his lips touched it. . . . Very quickly he bent forward, bit the stud, and hoisted the bomb over the side.

The bomb flashed blinding scarlet in mid-air and fell, a descending column of blaze eddying spirally in the midst of a whirlwind. Both the airplanes were tossed like shuttlecocks, hurled high and sideways; and the steersman . . . fought in great banking curves for a balance. . . . When he could look down again it was like looking down upon the crater of a small volcano. In the open garden before the Imperial castle a shuddering star of evil splendor spurted and poured up smoke and flame toward them like an accusation. . . . Suddenly the façade tottered and crumbled before the flare as sugar dissolves in water. The man stared for a moment . . . hoisted out another bomb and sent it down after its fellow. . . . Then that bomb had exploded, and steersman, thrower, and airplane were just flying rags and splinters of metal and drops of moisture in the air, and a third column of fire rushed eddying down upon the doomed buildings below. . . .

Now the mechanism of Wells's bomb may sound a little primitive, but its action was more advanced than that of the bomb that wiped out Hiroshima—for it operated on the principle of continuing explosion. We won't try to explain it to you here; it is enough to say that the radio-activity of the bombs dropped on Berlin was "never entirely exhausted," so that for years afterward "the battlefields and bomb-fields of that frantic time" were "sprinkled with radiant matter and so centers of inconvenient rays."

Perhaps it should be mentioned that Mr. Wells's book, although written in 1914, chronicled a war that took place about forty years later, in the words of a man living in the World Republic that was established after the peace. We wouldn't want our readers to get their dates mixed up. Because we now present that man's backward glance at the social and political impact of the first atomic bombs.

Certainly it seems now that nothing could have been more obvious to the people of the early twentieth century.

* Published by E. P. Dutton and Co.

than the rapidity with which war was becoming impossible. And as certainly they did not see it. They did not see it until the atomic bombs burst in their fumbling hands. Yet the broad facts must have glared upon any intelligent mind. All through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the amount of energy that men were able to command was continually increasing. Applied to warfare, that meant that the power to inflict a blow, the power to destroy, was continually increasing. There was no increase whatever in the ability to escape. Every sort of passive defense . . . was being outmastered by this tremendous increase on the destructive side. Destruction was becoming so facile that any little body of malcontents could use it; it was revolutionizing the problems of police and internal rule. . . . These facts were before the minds of everybody; the children in the street knew them. And yet the world still, as the Americans used to phrase it, "fooled around" with the paraphernalia and pretensions of war.

It is only by realizing this profound, this fantastic divorce between the scientific and intellectual movement on the one hand and the world of the lawyer-politician on the other that the men of a later time can hope to understand this preposterous state of affairs. Social organization was still in the barbaric stage. . . . The community as a whole was aimless, untrained, and unorganized to the pitch of imbecility. Collective civilization, the "modern state," was still in the womb of the future.

But even the atomic bomb did not immediately wake people up. The great war went on. One of Mr. Wells's lesser heroes was fighting in Holland when the Central Europeans dropped atomic bombs on the dikes. He describes in his diary the thunder, the flaring trail in the night sky, the tremendous pillars of fire, the roaring wind. Then the awful moment when he knew the dikes were gone and the sea was coming in. (He and his men barely escaped destruction in their landing barges.) The catastrophe wiped out most of the population and most of the invading armies. His barge made a "strange overland voyage among trees and houses and churches by Zaandam and between Haarlem and Amsterdam to Leiden."

"I do not think any of us felt we belonged to a defeated army, nor had we any strong sense of the war as the dominating fact about us. Our mental setting had far more of the effect of a huge natural catastrophe. The atomic bomb had dwarfed the international issues to complete insignificance. When our minds wandered from the preoccupations of our immediate needs, we speculated upon the possibility of stopping the use of these frightful explosives before the world was utterly destroyed. For to us it seemed quite plain that these bombs and the still greater power of destruction of which they were the precursors might quite easily shatter every relationship and institution of mankind."

Just as men are thinking and saying today. But then the bombs kept falling and war went on interminably, it seemed, until eventually, on a mountainside overlooking Lake Maggiore, "away from burning cities and starving multitudes," there gathered "the conference of rulers that was to arrest, if possible, before it was too late, the debacle of civilization."

They did it too, though not without dispute, and conflicts of interest, and the final, climactic danger that they might

all be blown to eternity, along with their plans, by the cunning King of the Balkans, known as the Slavic Fox, who had a few atomic bombs secreted near the meeting place. They did it because they dared not do otherwise. Some of them wanted a limited form of international control, a sort of United Nations Charter. But this, of course, was nonsense, as young King Egbert pointed out. "There's got to be one single government for the whole world," said the King over his shoulder to his adviser, Firmin, who had taught politics at the London School of Sociology, Economics, and Political Science. Firmin protested.

"Yesterday," said the King by way of explanation, "the Japanese very nearly got San Francisco."

"I hadn't heard, sir."

"The Americans ran the Japanese airplane down into the sea, and there the bomb got busted."

"Under the sea, sir?"

"Yes. Submarine volcano. The steam is in sight of the California coast. It was as near as that. And with things like this happening, you want me to go up this hill and haggle. . . ."

Enthusiasm gripped the conference as the meetings went on. King Egbert's youthful optimism spread among the older statesmen (there was no Big Three). They set up a World Government, which, for the moment, was themselves; they took over all the plants and materials for the production of atomic explosives (nobody even suggested separate control when the obvious price was cosmic disaster); and then they set to work to plan the administration of the world. There was little disposition to argue; too much needed to be done too fast. Mr. Wells describes "the condition of mankind at the close of the period of warring states, in the year of crisis that followed the release of atomic power." The huge, overcrowded cities which, "under the shock of the atomic bombs," had been emptied largely of their population so that masses of people were "dispossessed and scattered disastrously over the surrounding areas." The countryside "disordered by a multitude of wandering and lawless strangers." Hunger. Disease. Large areas of China "a prey to brigand bands." And huge danger zones, in which fires burned and explosions continued.

Obviously the new government had to "act greatly." "From the first they had to see the round globe as one problem"—one world. Nothing could be done on a small scale or country by country.

Of course all this meant socialism, although the Council had been predisposed to reconstitute the system that prevailed before the coming of atomic energy. They soon realized that capitalism had been rendered obsolete by the character of the disaster as well as by the onset of limitless energy. A new society and a whole new concept of man's place in the world became inevitable.

Once the world was released from the hardening insecurities of a needless struggle for life that was collectively planless and individually absorbing, it became apparent that there was in the vast mass of people a long-smothered passion to make things. . . . The majority of our population consists of artists and the bulk of activity in the world lies no longer with necessities but with their elaboration, decoration, and refinement. . . . Property was never more

than a means to an end, nor avarice more than a perversion.

Karenin, the dying Russian sage, described very well the period through which the world had passed and the role the atomic bomb had played in setting it free.

"Our age," he said, "has been so far an age of scene-shifting. We have been preparing a stage, clearing away the setting of a drama that was played out and growing tiresome. . . . If I could but sit out the first few scenes of the new spectacle. . . .

"How encumbered the world had become! It was ailing with a growth of unmeaning things. It was entangled,

feverish, confused. It was in sore need of release, and I suppose that nothing less than the violence of those bombs could have released it and made it a healthy world again. I suppose they were necessary. . . . We've had unity and collectivism blasted into our brains. . . .

"You know, I've got a fancy—it is hard to prove such things—that civilization was very near disaster when the atomic bombs came banging into it, that if there had been no Holsten and no induced radio-activity, the world would have—smashed—much as it did. Only instead of its being a smash that opened a way to better things, it might have been a smash without a recovery."

F. K.

Progress in Yugoslavia

BY HAL LEHRMAN

[Mr. Lehrman, The Nation's correspondent in the Mediterranean area, has worked for the Associated Press, Havas, and the OWI.]

Belgrade, August 9 (By cable)

THE men who created Partisan Yugoslavia are engaged on their most constructive work since the liberation of Belgrade. Up to the time of this writing, Marshal Tito has delivered two major addresses which have locked the door on the royal house of Karageorgevich and reoriented Yugoslav foreign policy in the direction of speedy national rehabilitation with aid from the Allies and from reparations. A wide amnesty and reprieve for all those who were led by compulsion or confusion to work for the enemy during the occupation has already opened many jails—six hundred prisoners were released yesterday from the Kragujevats internment camp alone—and relieved many thousands more from the threat of arrest by the OZNA, the secret police agency which quaintly decodes itself into "Department for the Protection of People." The abolition of censorship of outgoing dispatches has given startling proof of the regime's growing self-confidence and makes Yugoslavia—which claims never to have rejected a single application for entry—the one country in Central and Eastern Europe where foreign correspondents are restrained only by discretion and professional integrity.

The separate National Liberation fronts in the six federal states have been welded into a united People's Front modeled on the central Belgrade government's federative relationship to the autonomous governments of Yugoslavia's distinct nationalities. The new over-all party adopted a charter of principles infused with a spirit of unity among the Yugoslav peoples, and with a program of Balkan peace, democratic republicanism, and far-reaching social welfare.

AVNOJ—the Anti-Fascist Emergency Parliament—which developed out of the resistance committee in the early days of the occupation, has made room for new deputies from groups outside the People's Front in line with the Yalta agreement providing for full democracy. The AVNOJ is now sitting to consider bills for agrarian reform, suffrage, freedom of the courts, of the press, and of public meeting, and the

mechanism for the October election of a Constituent Assembly which will write AVNOJ out of existence by devising a constitutional government.

Some of the AVNOJ projects are still in the form of preliminary drafts and have not yet been approved by the Cabinet, let alone Parliament. No authoritative data on the bills concerning the courts and public meetings is available, for example. Enough has been divulged by cautious officials, however, to permit the following preview of the most important impending and epochal legislation:

Suffrage. Both sexes, eighteen years of age and over, will have the right to vote as well as soldiers and ex-guerrillas under eighteen. (There is a sub-lieutenant, aged thirteen, walking around Belgrade with a revolver and gold stripes; he used to crawl through the German lines carrying dispatches.) Members of the reactionary cabinets between the 1929 Zivkovich and the 1939 Cvetkovich governments will not vote, with the exception of those who fought against the occupation. Barred also are collaborators with the Germans or Chetniks, and political or criminal fascists and their families unless the latter can prove anti-fascist activity. The extent to which this week's amnesty will affect the political rights of the reprieved in borderline cases has not yet been clarified.

Electoral procedure. The parties inside or outside the dominant People's Front will be able to put up lists of candidates in any department if they obtain merely 150 petitions from half of the constituencies within it. Departments range in population up to 400,000, with a parliamentary seat for each 40,000. Secrecy of elections is assured: ballot tokens are concealed by hand and dropped into one of a series of ballot boxes. This technique, invented for a largely illiterate peasantry, was scrapped by the dictatorship during the controlled elections of 1931, 1935, and 1939, when balloting was open. The methods of voting and of legalizing candidacy lists were the most crucial points in the recent Cabinet discussions. Persistent but unconfirmed reports said that the moderate members even considered resigning rather than yield to the Communist pressure for a less secret voting system and for a requirement that parties must secure peti-

tions on a nation-wide basis, which would have shut out numerous strictly regional parties.

Agrarian reform. The large estates will be expropriated without compensation, also church and monastery lands. The latter will be left five hectares each except in the case of monasteries of historic value, which will retain twenty hectares. (A hectare is a little less than two and a half acres.) The maximum limit of landholdings per person is unspecified, but it is known that the so-called middle peasant with medium properties above the maximum will be compensated for the section expropriated.

The most momentous single development of the week is the unequivocal position taken by Tito and the all-powerful People's Front coalition against the return of the monarchy. Marshal Tito's denunciation of Peter for complicity with the Chetniks has finished the Subasich truce which suspended discussion of the regime until a plebiscite could be held. Speaker after speaker in the later sessions of the Front congress and AVNOJ hammered more nails into the royal coffin. The press campaign is wide open. The leading Communist organ, *Borba*, even linked Peter's name with the current trial of twenty-five Mihailovich followers here which has aroused the entire country with the details of large-scale massacres by the Chetniks and their chief's betrayal of Yugoslavia to the Axis.

It is now disclosed that there will be no separate plebiscite on the issue of monarchy versus republic. The voters will indicate their choice by the selection of deputies to the Constituent Assembly. The verdict is easy to predict—and Peter's cashing of the regency shows that he, too, can read the handwriting on the wall.

The major emphasis of this historic week has been on internal reconstruction, but Yugoslavia's determination to reconstruct beyond its frontiers as well has not been hidden. The newspapers continue to be filled with complaints about the treatment of Yugoslavs and anti-fascists in Trieste, Carinthia, and other irredenta under Allied occupation. Vice-Premier Edvard Kardelj told the Front's congress, amid ecstatic cheering, "We do not want anything belonging to others but we will not renounce what belongs to us." The Macedonian leader, Dmitar Vlahov, charged the Greek government with a deliberate drive to exterminate his compatriots in "Aegean" Macedonia and demanded "adequate measures to stop these criminal acts once and for all." The President of the AVNOJ, Ivan Ribar, spoke of the nation's hope that "in the new democratic federative Yugoslavia, all our territories will be united with us and the possibility of enslavement will be ended for those regions we rightfully desire."

Tito himself, after paying tribute for the first time to the "Anglo-American fliers who, in greatest danger, supplied our fighters with materials and food," expressed confidence that "the suffering and sacrifices and contribution of the Yugoslav peoples to the Allied cause are so incontestable that our legitimate claims will not be disputed at the peace conference."

The Marshal, however, gave a significant turn to this policy by linking losses and aspirations in a new formula. Taking sixty-one billion dinars as the measure of Yugoslavia's war damage, he revealed his intention of presenting

a bill for extensive reparations for the consideration of the Allies. His demands include transportation from Germany of "entire factories necessary for the rehabilitation of our country." As for the Italians, the Marshal thundered, they, like the Germans, have not yet paid a dinar of compensation; nevertheless "reactionary elements in Italy today are transforming themselves from accused into accusers and slanderers of our peoples. The tens of thousands of our slaughtered can never be compensated for, but the burned villages, the destroyed towns, and everything which has been stolen must be compensated for at the expense of these reactionaries. It is a matter for the Italian people to decide."

In the Wind

GET TOGETHER, BOYS: Charles W. Kellogg, president of the Edison Electric Institute, told the *New York Times* on August 8 that atomic energy would have little effect on the electric light and power industry, since its fuel costs were relatively small anyhow, and intimated that prices would not be materially reduced. In the same story an unidentified "representative of the electric companies" was quoted as asking, "What's the use of the government embarking on further expensive hydro-electric projects when the future of power production is about to be revolutionized?"

P. T. WONG, an American of Chinese descent and a veteran of World War II, recently tried to buy a laundry at 3325 Geary Boulevard, San Francisco. He met the requirements of the City Health Department for operating a laundry, and Dr. J. C. Geiger, Health Officer, granted him a permit. But the purchase was never made, because the Geary Boulevard Merchants Association and the Park-Presidio Improvement Club protested. The secretary of the Club said it had "tried to keep this a nice district," and added, "What's Geiger trying to do, anyway?" The secretary's name is C. E. Rankin.

A WASHINGTON FIRM of speech-writers sends us a catalogue of its wares. It features two "Special Political Addresses: 1550—Anti-New Deal—A sizzling appraisal of the New Deal; facts, humor, sarcasm. Over 3,000 words. \$3. 1551—Pro-New Deal—The other side of the question. Answer to the critics. Campaign thunder and lightning that really strikes. \$3. Both addresses for \$5."

"READERS OF the *Chicago Tribune* are best informed about events in Washington and thruout the world," says the *Chicago Tribune*, "because they read the dispatches of seasoned correspondents who know how to get at the real facts of the news and who write from the American viewpoint."

THIS IS FROM the June issue of the *Improvement Era*, an official publication of the Mormon Church: "When our leaders speak, the thing has been done. When they propose a plan—it is God's plan. When they point the way, there is no other which is safe. When they give direction, it should mark the end of controversy. God works in no other way."

[We invite our readers to submit material for *In the Wind*. One dollar will be paid for each item accepted.]

BOOKS and the ARTS

NOTES BY THE WAY

BY MARGARET MARSHALL

AS THE NATION POINTED OUT two weeks ago, in discussing the trial of Pétain, the civil war which has been going on in France for the past decade or more is still in progress and is moving into its decisive phase. One of its most vivid manifestations is the debate about the purge—a debate which began with liberation and has been refueled by the Pétain trial. Everyone agrees that proved traitors should be executed. The important question is whether those whose behavior, before and during the occupation, contributed to the fall of France should be held to strict account or forgiven in the name of unity and reconciliation. François Mauriac, who writes in *Figaro*, has been a leading exponent of the thesis that “we are all guilty” and that the divisions within France, between men and parties, should be dissolved in the crucible of Christian charity. His comment on the Pétain trial, reported at length in the *New York Times*, was merely a restatement of his position.

Christian charity, reconciliation, unity are beautiful concepts and they make good copy. The appeal to these abstract sentiments, however, is also a well-known device for confusing issues and warding off unwelcome decisions. Mauriac is a spokesman for the Catholic Church, which maintained a “charitable” attitude toward fascism until it became a menace to the church itself but is now busily proving that it always abhorred fascism. That being so, one has the right to wonder if his eloquent appeal is not, in part at least, an attempt to counter and confuse the popular demand for a clear decision against the old order in France of which the church was both stay and beneficiary.

A correspondent who thinks it is just that has been kind enough to send me a copy of an article by Mauriac, *The Year of Reconciliation*, which presents his thesis, along with a copy of a reply to that thesis by Albert Camus which appeared in *Combat*, one of the resistance papers. The two articles appeared last January but they are still relevant, for the great debate is still going on and the future health of France depends upon the way in which it is resolved. A few excerpts from Mauriac’s article are sufficient to give its point, for it is not only eloquent but vague and long-winded.

I do not wish to write a single word here [he says] which might add to the heat of passion.... But let us realize this: never did the words of the Gospel, “He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone”—never did they seem more timely than today.... Have you never at any moment, at least in a certain measure, committed the fault with which you reproach your adversaries? Has ideological passion never spoken more strongly in you than the interest of France, has the defense of the nation never been subordinated to your political partisanship?... Each of us can find in his past enough errors to be able to understand a graver error on the part of others, and to forgive them when the time comes.... May

this year of victorious peace carry another name in history and remain forever in the memory of our sons the blessed year of reconciliation.

Camus is not tempted by this elegant invitation to hit the sawdust trail. I quote his reply at length, for several reasons: it seems to me excellent and right; his view, as my correspondent says, is “far more representative of the young, poised, and exacting France of the resistance”; and this view has had very little press in this country.

Camus asserts that he would not have replied to Mauriac if he had not felt that “this discussion, of which the subject is our very life,” was beginning to turn into confusion. Then he continues:

Each time, apropos of the purge, I have spoken of justice, M. Mauriac has spoken of charity.... We are of those who reject both the cries of hatred reaching us from one side and the tearful entreaties rising from the other. We seek that just voice which will give us truth without shame.... For this we do not need to be clear about everything; we need only to *want* clarity with that fervor of heart and intellect without which neither M. Mauriac nor ourselves can accomplish any good.

That is why I can say that charity has no relevance here.... M. Mauriac does not wish to add to the store of hatred, and I willingly follow him in that. For my part I do not wish any increase of error, and on this point I await *his* approval. In sum, I wait for him to say openly that there is today a necessary justice.... I see two roads to death for our country (and there are manners of survival that are no better than death). These two roads are those of hatred and pardon.... I shall openly grant pardon when the family of Velin, when the wife of Leynaud have told me that I may do so. But not before, never before....

As a man, I might admire M. Mauriac for knowing how to love traitors, but as a citizen I should deplore him because this very love would bring upon us a nation of traitors and mediocrities and a society we no longer want.

I believe I have a just conception of the grandeur of Christianity, but some of us in this persecuted world have the feeling that if Christ died for certain people, he did not die for us. And moreover, we refuse to despair of man. Without having any exaggerated ambition to save him, we hold at least to the idea of serving him.... On this point I may say to M. Mauriac that we shall not be discouraged and that to the last we shall reject a divine charity that would deprive men of the justice which is their due.

“While no mention of the Catholic Church is made either in Mauriac’s article or in Camus’s spirited reply,” writes my correspondent, “it is, I venture to say, the attitude of the church which is at the burning heart of the question.... It will be interesting to see if the ‘moral aspects of the purge’ do not in the end reduce the *épuration* to a conflict between the Catholic and the non-Catholic elements in France, or even in Europe—and I am not forgetting De Gaulle as I write this. In fact I am waiting—with some trepidation—

for him to prove that political justice is not a question for the church to decide upon."

It may well be that the exchange between Mauriac and Camus should be subtitled *The Trial of the Vatican*, but the secular vaticans, economic and political, also have a stake in the moderation Mauriac pleads for. It will be interesting to see what verdict is contained in the French elections.

Albert Camus, by the way, is one of the two outstanding playwrights who have recently come to the fore in France, the other being Jean-Paul Sartre. *Horizon* for May contains a long and extremely interesting essay on these two writers whose plays "are the proof that in France the fourth wall of the theater is still, as it has always been, a triumphal arch of the mind."

OVERHEARD on one of New England's "best" beaches: "But my dear, couldn't the King just appoint Churchill again?"

Poets of Republican Spain

CONTEMPORARY SPANISH POETRY: SELECTIONS FROM TEN POETS. Translated by Eleanor L. Turnbull, with Spanish Originals; and Personal Reminiscences of the Poets, by Pedro Salinas. The Johns Hopkins Press. \$3.50.

THE Spanish Republic had other poets besides García Lorca, and Miss Turnbull has performed a useful service in making selections of their work available to the English-reading public. Of the nine who have survived Lorca, only two, Gerardo Diego and Vicente Aleixandre, are today living—who knows on what terms?—in the land of their birth. Pedro Salinas and Jorge Guillén are teaching in the United States, the former at present on leave from Johns Hopkins at the University of Puerto Rico; José Moreno Villa, Emilio Prados, and Manuel Altolaguirre are in Mexico; Rafael Alberti is in Buenos Aires; Luis Cernuda is in England, teaching at Cambridge.

Each poet is represented by ten to twenty poems, in the original and in translation; each is given from twenty-five to fifty pages. Miss Turnbull's translations do not err on the side of ambition: she has eschewed rhyme, almost entirely; done little with assonance; followed the text closely, though sometimes transposing lines; in general, she has been content to convey the statement of the original, with not too much concern for the effects. The language in which the poems come out does not sound too translationish; one would recognize the originals for poetry, or sometimes rhetoric, rather than for prose.

The Lorca items momentarily excepted, the most interesting work in this anthology seems to be that of José Moreno Villa and Luis Cernuda. The space allowed Jorge Guillén, I think, might have been reduced; nor would I object to having Gerardo Diego eliminated altogether in favor, say, of Miguel Hernandez or José Herrera Petere. Miss Turnbull says that her choice of items has been conditioned largely by the ease with which poems lent themselves to English translation: has she not, perhaps, leaned rather heavily on Gerardo Diego's anthology as her primary source of material?

It does not seem quite right that with so many of these poets living in exile, so few of the poems written during the Spanish war should be included. Luis Cernuda's beautiful *Impression of Exile* is about the only poem here that refers even to the aftermath of that anguish; yet most of the other poets contributed abundantly to the "Romancero General de la Guerra de España," published in Madrid and Valencia in 1937; and Alberti, Altolaguirre, Cernuda, Villa, and Prados are all found in "Poetas en La España Leal," published, likewise, in Madrid and Valencia in the same year. To represent Alberti without the Hymn to the International Brigades, or Madrid, Capital of Glory; to represent Villa without Madrid, Frente de Lucha or El Hombre del Momento; to omit all of Prados's balladry of the war—these seem like acts of injustice and distortion.

As for Lorca, Miss Turnbull, knowing that Lorca has been translated by a number of English and American poets, has deliberately refrained from reading any of those translations, "not wanting to be influenced by them in any way." This, I think, was a mistake; for of the eighteen Lorca items presented, only half a dozen short lyrics have not been previously published in English. However inadequate former translations may have been, there is still so much of Lorca untranslated that it seems a pity to repeat so many more or less familiar items, especially as some of them are not in themselves very important, and have attracted translators in the same way that Miss Turnbull has been attracted, by their ease of rendition. Of the Lament for the Death of Ignacio Sanchez Mejías Miss Turnbull presents only the first two sections.

The personal reminiscences of the poets, written by Pedro Salinas, are characterized by intimacy, affection, and sprightliness. The biographical notes include some summing up of poetical works by each author.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES

BRIEFER COMMENT

The Old Lady Shows Her Medals

THE Bank of England is unique in many ways. No other financial institution combines its age, authority, resources, and influence. None has been more revered as a temple of the financial virtues; none more reviled for alleged economic machiavellianism. As the subject of a book, therefore, the Old Lady of Threadneedle Street has glamorous possibilities, but Sir John Clapham has written "The Bank of England—A History" (two volumes, Macmillan, \$7.50) chiefly for his fellow economic historians. Having enjoyed access to the archives and account books of the Bank, he has produced a mine of information in which many other writers will quarry profitably. The general reader, however, will probably find the book hard going and its pages overlaid with figures.

Nevertheless, this work is particularly welcome today when the Bank of England seems about to suffer a sea-change as a result of the rising tide of socialism in Britain. Indeed, one wonders whether the directors, when they asked Sir John to undertake this history in celebration of the Old Lady's two hundred and fiftieth birthday, were not moved by a desire to

improve their public relations in anticipation of some such dangerous development. I do not wish to suggest, however, that there is any taint of propaganda about the book; the author is far too scrupulous a scholar for that. But he is also conservative in outlook and inevitably emphasizes the way in which the Bank, "broadening from precedent to precedent," has evolved from a somewhat speculative money-making venture into a semi-public institution, untrammelled by sordid motives.

It has, he says in his epilogue, finally moved into the position "of an organization functioning in close contact with those in political authority but not controlled by them continuously or in detail. . . . After two centuries and a half it was a non-competitive public institution with world-wide connections and influence, not eager for profit but anxious—in the adapted words of . . . the Declaration made by all its directors—'faithfully and honestly to demean itself according to the best of its skill and understanding' and to be 'indifferent and equal to all manner of persons.'"

In urging nationalization of the Bank, the Labor Party is unlikely to argue that its directors have been false to these ideals. The issue is not their integrity but the danger of concentration of financial power in the hands of a small body of men not representing the total interests of the community or directly responsible to it. Now that Britain can no longer afford an unplanned economy, its government must, of necessity, take over an organization which has the power to thwart its plans.

KEITH HUTCHISON

The Fight for the Forests

CONSERVATION OF FORESTS and soil resources in America is no longer an academic matter. The TVA, our many soil conservation districts throughout the nation, and the work of the United States Forest Service have brought into actual operation the dynamic principle of river and forest restoration for multiple use, with human welfare as the ultimate object.

In "Behold Our Green Mansions" (Chapel Hill, \$4) Richard Boerker has written an authoritative and up-to-date book on the state of our forests throughout the country, and he has also outlined the fascinating story of the growth of forest conservation from its early beginnings. The author has served with the United States Forest Service for many years, has written extensively, and is a teacher. His book is the result of a long and valuable experience. It is beautifully made, thoroughly documented, and filled with fine photographs.

Unfortunately, "Behold Our Green Mansions" is not written in a style which will have great popular appeal, and this is a pity. Moreover, the last chapter, which should have brought together the author's really valuable information and sound arguments and arrived at some conclusions, tends to leave the reader confused. At one point, for instance, he makes an excellent case for government ownership for at least 60 per cent of commercial forest land, and implies that private ownership in this sphere has failed, and is likely to continue to fail, to meet national requirements for timber products. A little farther on he comes out strongly for public regulation of private forest management, which seems to imply that he believes that there is a large place for private forest ownership. And the last section indicates that the pri-

vately-owned forest industries are doing an excellent job and can be depended upon to take care of the whole situation, and that all the the government need do is provide a little fire protection. If this means that he has here swallowed, hook, line, and sinker, the propaganda of the forest products industries which is directed against public ownership and regulation, it is out of keeping with the general character of the book. "Behold Our Green Mansions" is, on the whole, a reliable and valuable addition to our literature on American forestry and its importance to American citizens. If it is at times undecisive on a matter of public policy, it is definitely convincing as to the need for public understanding of this important problem.

P. ALSTON WARING

Moronic Revelations

FILIPPO BOJANO, author of "In the Wake of the Goosestep" (Ziff-Davis, \$2.50), is an Italian journalist who worked for Mussolini's *Popolo d'Italia* and the *Agencia Stefani* from 1926 to the bitter end. His book promises "to reveal the inside story of the most infamous partnership the world has ever known." Signor Bojano was close to the leading figures of this partnership. As correspondent in Berlin he was honored by the mission to write special reports for the Duce himself; he travelled with Hitler and Ciano on official journeys. Nevertheless, he reports nothing new in his so-called revelations. The little incidents in his personal career, the loss of his job in Berlin, seem to have been Signor Bojano's most exciting experiences in those tremendous years. "In the Wake of the Goosestep," at best, "reveals" the inferiority of those writers who, like Signor Bojano, were used by the Fascist leaders for important duties.

JOSEPH BORNSTEIN

Russia: An Optimist's View

IT IS GOOD to see Edgar Snow's calm opinions about Soviet Russia attaining wide circulation, especially after snap-judgments such as W. L. White's. "The Pattern of Soviet Power" (Random House, \$2.75) is based on a series of articles written for the *Saturday Evening Post*. Mr. Snow is explaining Russia to Americans in a simple and convincing way, rather than attempting any profound new analysis of what makes the U. S. S. R. click.

Admittedly, Mr. Snow is an optimist about Russia on nearly every count; he is not, however, a supine flatterer, being a conscientious newspaperman of long experience in Russia and the Orient. He believes that Russia wants stability, not revolution, in neighboring countries. The presence of the Red Army has set free the Communist forces in Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Yugoslavia; but in his opinion the Communists have "behaved cautiously" and "contented themselves with fewer positions of power than the real relation of forces might justify." This particular optimism may seem a bit strong in view of the way Russia has sealed off eastern European states from world observation.

In ten or fifteen years, Mr. Snow thinks, Russia may attain the world's highest mass living standard outside the United States. Although still suspicious of capitalistic Europe, Russia has, he believes, no militaristic or aggressive designs. And when the Soviet Union becomes prosperous and feels wholly secure from outside peril, "it may become possible for the

Russian people to enjoy the freedoms of political democracy . . . side by side with the Soviet system of economy."

MARCUS DUFFIELD

Four-Dimensional Planning

ONE OF THE BEST BALANCED STUDIES I know on the protean subject of city planning is Henry S. Churchill's new book, "The City Is the People" (Reynal and Hitchcock, \$3.) The volume takes up Antecedents, Precedents (a distinction with a difference), Approach, Problems, Efforts, and Trends, a program which ought to satisfy the most exacting. The author is not an Ayn Rand Superman, but a practical architect with culture and no crotchet.

It would be easy enough to pick flaws in the historical part. Churchill takes the conventional view of Napoleon III: "a despot and a fool." But the reconstruction of Paris—a grand achievement, in spite of all flaws—was the Emperor's idea; the plan was drawn by him. He picked out Haussmann as a very efficient instrument.

Churchill is no angry prophet of social righteousness. But he believes firmly that society as a whole is responsible for the chaos of our cities, and that society should bear the cost of clearing up the mess. What with the extreme division of property and inflated land values, it is exceedingly difficult for private initiative to correct the crying evils. Even large-scale operations like Stuyvesant Town, if subjected to the necessity of definite returns, will fall far short of the goal: a grand opportunity missed, and a deplorable example. Churchill would have the cities clear up the blighted core, and keep control of the land: not "communism," but inevitable "collectivism" where rugged individualism has signally failed. Our first concern should be for men, not for property: "The City is the People." The illustrations are extremely varied, from El Greco's Toledo to Churchill's own plan for Acquackanonk Village. I wish I could discuss at length Churchill's conception of four-dimensional planning. There is a fifth dimension, Money, and it should be kept in proper perspective.

ALBERT GUERARD

Northwest Recaptured

JAMES GRAY, literary editor of the St. Paul *Dispatch* and author of "Pine, Stream, and Prairie: Wisconsin and Minnesota in Profile" (Knopf, \$3.50), is not a tiresome regionalist. He does not insist too much on a locality, as do the professional Southerners, nor does he subject us to the blasts of a Hamlin Garland or a Sinclair Lewis. And yet he never provides fodder for a business man's banquet. Instead, he thoughtfully summarizes a one-hundred-year record, seldom scanting either failures or accomplishments, and thus convinces the reader that he has seen his community whole while preserving his attachment to it.

But the balance of his approach is fortified by his literary competence. While devoting at least nine of his twenty-four chapters to resources and population waves and the habitat of "Sky-blue Water," and five more to such topics as vacationing, the local arts, and colleges, he never does so in the road-map style of the usual tourist book. He is the capable newspaperman with an assignment, and he fulfils it. But

Mr. Gray surpasses this level in his ablest chapters—notably on such agrarian leaders as Ignatius Donnelly, the first and honorable Charles A. Lindbergh, and that magnificent lion from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette, Sr.—and again in his treatment of such thinkers as the late Thorstein Veblen and Frederick J. Turner, and the architect Frank Lloyd Wright. And he certainly etches the profiles of the major cities. He might have discussed Superior, Wisconsin, that blighted ore port at the head of the Lakes. He could well have included such figures as Thomas Boyd, Angna Enters, and Georgia O'Keeffe, all natives of the region he describes. Yet the general picture stands—this undoubtedly because its truth and shapeliness are supported by the long-standing pledge of this modest writer to his community.

JEROME MELLQUIST

"Chin Music"

AMONG THEIR OWN KIND cowboys are seldom "hog-tied when it comes to makin' chin music." Ramon F. Adams, a business man who has made the study of the folklore and history of the cattle country a lifelong hobby, has written an unusual and delightful book—"Western Words: A Dictionary of the Range, Cow Camp, and Trail" (University of Oklahoma Press, \$3). Writers, semanticists, and scholars will find this book invaluable. The general reader will find it fascinating. Mr. Adams gives the meaning—and often the derivation and pronunciation—of thousands of words and phrases ranging from "ace in the hole" to "zorrillas." The author demonstrates scholarship, wide familiarity with the men of whom he writes, and a sense of humor.

RALPH ADAMS BROWN

FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE

THE NATION
20 Vesey Street
New York 7, N. Y.

Dear Sirs:

I want to subscribe to *The Nation*, or the following *Nation* magazine combinations as listed below:

.....
.....
.....
☐ Remittance enclosed ☐ Bill me

NAME.....
STREET.....
CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....

Money-Saving Magazine Combinations

THE Nation
with **Harpers Magazine** \$6.50
You save \$2.50
with **Consumers Union** \$7.00
You save \$1.50
with **HARPERS & Consumers Union** \$9.00
You save \$3.50
with **Free World** \$7.50
You save \$1.50
with **Saturday Review** \$8.50
You save \$1.50

All club combinations listed are for one year, and may be mailed to different individuals and addresses. Canadian and foreign postage extra.

THE NATION BY ITSELF

1 Year \$5 2 Years \$8
3 Years \$11
Servicemen's Rate:
\$3 a Year
Canadian and Foreign
Postage, \$1 a Year Extra

8-18-45

MOTION PICTURES

WARNER BROS. MAGNIFICENT
RHAPSODY
 IN BLUE
 NOW HOLLYWOOD THEATRE

IT'S GEORGE GABRIEL'S
 "JUBILANT"
 STORY!

Barbara STANWYCK • Dennis MORGAN
 Sydney GREENSTREET
 IN WARNER BROS. NEW HIT
"CHRISTMAS IN CONNECTICUT"
 In Person! ERSKINE HAWKINS
 And His Orchestra
 Also In Person—THE CHARIOTEERS
 BEN CARTER and MANTAN MORELAND

STRAND

... IT IS WORTH ANY DOZEN
 RUN-OF-THE-STUDIO
 ACADEMY AWARD WINNERS
 — TIME

DAVID L. LOEW
 presents

**The
 Southerner**

A Jean Renoir production

starring
ZACHARY SCOTT **BETTY FIELD**

Now playing at
BRANDT'S GLOBE
 BROADWAY AT FORTY-SIXTH STREET

STAGE PLAY

MICHAEL TODD Presents
UP IN CENTRAL PARK
 Book by HERBERT LYRICS by DOROTHY FIELDS MUSIC by SIGMUND ROMBERG
 & DOROTHY FIELDS
 BROADWAY THEATRE, Broadway & 53rd Street, Matinees Wed. & Sat.
 REALLY AIR-CONDITIONED

CONTRIBUTORS

ROLFE HUMPHRIES translated Federico García Lorca's posthumous collection of poems, "The Poet in New York," and edited with M. J. Benardete the Loyalist anthology "And Spain Sings."

P. ALSTON WARING is a Pennsylvania farmer and co-author of a book on the small farm, "Roots in the Earth."

JOSEPH BORNSTEIN was for many years managing editor of the *Tagebuch* in Berlin and later became editor-in-chief of the *Pariser Tageblatt*.

MARCUS DUFFIELD writes the weekly summary of the news, History in the Making, for the Sunday edition of the New York *Herald Tribune*.

ALBERT GUERARD, biographer of Napoleon III and a frequent contributor to *The Nation*, is the author of "The Future of Paris," a book on city planning.

JEROME MELLQUIST, a native of Minnesota, is the author of "The Emergence of an American Art." He is now writing a new book on American art.

RALPH ADAMS BROWN is now an instructor in the Coast Guard Academy Preparatory School. He has written for the *Yale Review*, the *Survey Graphic*, and other publications.

MOTION PICTURES

NOW RKO

BROOKLYN & QUEENS
 ALDEN Jamaica
 BUSHWICK DYKER
 Kelt's FLUSHING
 GREENPOINT
 KENMORE
 MADISON
 ORPHEUM
 PROSPECT
 REPUBLIC
 Kelt's RICHMOND HILL
 STRAND
 Far Rockaway
 TILYU

'FAST, ACTIONFUL TEMPO'—N. Y. Post
**PEARL BUCK'S
 CHINA SKY**
 Based on the Best-Selling Novel
 STARRING
**Randolph SCOTT • Ellen DREW
 Ruth WARRICK**
 — Plus —
 'BODY SNATCHER' BORIS KARLOFF
 BELA LUGOSI

**BETTY HUTTON
 ARTURO DE CORDOVA**
 In Paramount's
**"INCENDIARY
 BLONDE"**
 In Technicolor
 with Charles Ruggles
 Barry Fitzgerald • Maurice Rocco

In Person!
 "The Hour of Charm"
All-Girl Orch.
 Under the Direction of
Phil Spitalny
 With
 Evelyn • Jeannie
 Francine • Viola
 Mack Triplets
 All American Glee
 Club • Imogene Coco

NOW PLAYING **PARAMOUNT** TIMES SQUARE

+ RED CROSS plasma is saving the lives of hundreds of wounded soldiers and sailors. But thousands of additional blood donors are needed. Give a pint of blood to save a life.

Music

B. H.
HAGGIN

FRANCK'S Prelude, Chorale, and Fugue for piano is one of his best works, though not without certain of the characteristics that one dislikes in other works. The Prelude and Chorale are very beautiful; it is the Fugue that begins with arid formula and pushes on to bombast. Victor has issued a performance by Artur Rubinstein (Set 1004; \$2.50), which is satisfactory only in some parts of the work, for others are played in Rubinstein's mannered style that is more appropriate to Albéniz than to Franck, and there are erratic changes of pace in the Fugue. The performance is recorded with clarity and fidelity to timbre; but the sound has the characteristics of the Debussy recordings I described a few weeks ago: the treble is weak, and the climaxes don't achieve their correct volume of sound. The surfaces of my copy sputter and crackle.

"Tod und Verklärung" is one of Strauss's early works, with some imaginative and beautiful passages, but one which needs a plastic sense like Toscanini's to mould its episodes into a continuous, unified progression. What we have on records instead is Stokowski's hectic, spasmodic, and lurid performance—this time with the New York City Symphony (Set 1006; \$3.50). This is not a great orchestra; but it is disciplined and plays well. As for the recorded sound, which is spacious and natural, there are sides like the second on which it is hard but clear and well-balanced, and there are sides like the third on which it is somewhat confused, as though by reverberation, and the violins have an exaggerated, piercing intensity.

On a single disc (11-8848; \$1) is Iturbi's performance of Chopin's A flat Polonaise—full of vulgar affectations, and its recorded sound not only poor but with a lot of hash mixed in on the first side. And on another single disc (10-1173; \$.75) are Brahms's popular "Wiegenlied" and Reger's "Marienwiegenlied," beautifully sung by Blanche Thebom—but why in English, and why with string orchestra instead of piano, only Victor knows.

The muddy confusion in the sound of certain Columbia orchestral recordings that I discussed a couple of weeks ago is to be heard in the recording of a performance of Saint-Saëns's Piano Concerto No. 4 in C minor by Casadesus with the New York Philharmonic un-

der Rodzinski (Set 566; \$3.50). I have the impression that if the performance could be heard clearly it would turn out to be good; but it would still be unnecessary.

I am reminded of Shaw's comment on a performance of "Samson et Dalila" in 1893. "Who wants to hear 'Samson et Dalila'? I respectfully suggest, Nobody. In Paris that is not a reason for not producing it, because Saint-Saëns is an illustrious French composer, and the opera a national institution; consequently Saint-Saëns must occasionally compose an opera, and the director produce it. . . . In the same way, we produce specially composed oratorios at our English festivals. We cannot sit them out without wishing we had never been born; but we do sit them out for all that. . . . Now I am strongly of the opinion that each nation should bear its own burden in this department of life. We do not ask the Parisians to share the weight of 'Job' with us; then let them not foist on to us the load of 'Samson.'" I respectfully suggest that this wisdom be applied to the case of Roy Harris and Shostakovich: we would still have to listen to Roy Harris, but not to both Harris and Shostakovich.

This is by no means the only passage in Shaw's criticism of fifty years ago, which I reread recently, that remains enlightening and profitable today. During the intermission of a piano recital, for example, I read a paragraph about Giulia Ravogli's singing of an excerpt from Vaccai's "Giuletta e Romeo," which ended with the observation that the music was "for an age, but most emphatically not for all time." And this turned out to be the correct comment on Copland's Piano Variations, which was performed after the intermission.

And some time ago, writing about a bad recording, I quoted these remarks of a shrewd editor I know: "A record company thinks it's smart to sell a recording like that if people are willing to buy it; but it's stupid. Thousands of people are led to buy the recording because it's Beethoven—the 'Moonlight' Sonata—Serkin—Columbia, which means that it's good music; they hear something that sounds terrible and that they don't enjoy; and so thousands of people now have the idea that good music sounds terrible and is not for them, and enormous damage has been done to the cause of good music and to the record business." This was the very point made by Shaw in a review of a shoddy East End production of a West End opera: "When the [orchestra's] feeble and mis-

tuned scraping got very bad . . . doubtless the packed pittites said reverently, 'This is classical music. This is above our heads, this is.'"

RESORTS



VACATIONING
at Forest House
provides the ultimate in rest and relaxation. Superb location, two lakes, all sports. Congenial hospitality, fine food and splendid accommodations.
Lake Mahopac 688.

FOREST HOUSE
LAKE MAHOPAC, N. Y., TEL. MAHOPAC 688

"Fore" the Golfer
Newly Conditioned Course
A Grand "Pro"
New Clubhouse
. . . await your pleasure.



The Glenmere
28 miles of beautiful private trails. Also—excellent tennis, boating and fishing on our private 7½-mile lake, swimming, golf, game rooms, cocktail lounge, dancing, really fine food . . . congenial atmosphere.
Only 31 Miles from New York
CHESTER, N. Y. Chester 200 (N. Y.) RE 2-5047

CHI-WAN-DA
ON THE HUDSON
ULSTER PARK, N. Y. Phone Kingston 1329
Excellent Location, overlooking the Hudson River. Beautiful Lake on premises. All Water and Land Sports, Dancing, most modern improvements.
DIRECTIONS:
TRAIN—BUS—BOAT to KINGSTON
J. I. DOROSHKIN, Dir. 545 Fifth Ave.
N. Y. Office Phone: MU 2-4217

OAKWOOD
NEW WINDSOR, N. Y. Newburgh 4477
Delightful...swimming & boating on private lake.
Different...the colonial atmosphere.
Delicious...our unexcelled cuisine.
Diverting...recordings for listening & dancing.
All this only 53 miles from New York City
A Resort for Adults Only

NEW—Opened by Veteran World War II
THE COLONIAL Hotel & Restaurant
TERRACE Peekskill, N. Y.
Open All Year
Swimming • Tennis • Ping Pong
Field Activities • Dietary Laws
Rates and Information on Request

SHADYBROOK
MAHOPAC, N. Y. Tel. Mahopac 2320
50 miles from N. Y. 140 acres rustic country, secluded, restful, homelike. Unexcelled American cuisine. Sports, Movies. Beautiful walks, \$45.
Mrs. G. Popper

Letters to the Editors

To the People of Mississippi

Dear Sirs: A recent issue of the *Stars & Stripes* has brought to our attention the statement of Senator Eastland that the Negro soldier in this war has been "an utter and abysmal failure." This statement was made by a man in high government office who is supposed to help carry the torch of liberty. Many of us are alarmed and saddened to know that the people of the state of Mississippi have entrusted to this man the honor and responsibility of representing them in the government of the United States.

By this statement, and the attitude behind it, Senator Eastland demonstrates that he neither comprehends nor believes in the principles behind this war. Otherwise he would realize that service toward the cause of human liberty can be, and is, performed just as ably by a black man as it is by a white man.

Senator Eastland has betrayed us. He has not represented the cause for which we sent him to Washington. He is not interested in human liberties and promoting human freedom. He is not interested in understanding and helping to eradicate the causes of war. What does he care about the young men of America who have died in Europe, and Africa, and the Pacific, in the past few years? What does he care about the cause of liberty and freedom for which they fought and died, for which men and women of all races and colors gave their lives? Their victories and their heritage are for everyone—for men and women of all races and colors.

We fought the Nazis and Fascists because they represented a threat to our freedom and to the freedom of all people. We fought them because they tried to put one group of people above all others. They were interested in freedom not for all peoples, but for the "Nordic" few. In America we have people like that, too. They also preach a doctrine of racial superiority—the superiority of the white man over the black man—and seek to curb the freedom of the man who does not belong in their little world of hatred and prejudice. These men are fighting America and what she stands for just as much as any Nazi who ever uttered "Heil Hitler" or turned an "88" on American soldiers. These men are just as much ene-

mies of human freedom as were the Hitlers, the Goebbels, and the rest. Some of these men even manage to get into high government positions. Perhaps Senator Eastland is one of them—the people of Mississippi will be able to tell. Other Americans, and the millions of soldiers overseas, have faith in what the people of Mississippi will do to help the cause of free men everywhere.

SERVICEMAN FROM MISSOURI
Somewhere in Germany, July 12

Military Caste and Civilian Jobs

Dear Sirs: Douglas Smith, Scripps-Howard Washington correspondent, has uncovered a War Manpower Commission directive to give "the greatest assistance to young officer veterans" in their survey of available executive positions in business, industry, and government. The Commission has published a booklet, conspicuously labeled "Enlisted Men," listing all the types of army and navy duties and the corresponding civilian jobs for which these duties fitted the men. As Smith notes, WMC "apparently is trying to help carry the military caste system into civilian life by giving officers the first crack at the best jobs."

Since when has a government agency earned the prerogative to destroy a democratic principle that millions of Americans have left their homes to defend?—namely, the right of every man to qualify for a job on his individual merits, regardless of rank, creed, or color.

WMC's argument is that "many of these officers have married since they were called into service. They and their families are accustomed to living on an officer's income and they understandably do not want to alter their standard of living." This is true. But what consideration is being given to the far greater number of enlisted men and women who have accepted their lesser lot while fighting the concept of a Super Race? They do not begrudge their military officers an equal chance in competing for worthwhile civilian positions. As American citizens, they in turn do not expect to be denied that chance.

CORPORAL
San Francisco, Calif., July 29

A Test for FSA

Dear Sirs: The Farm Security Administration is on trial. On August 24 it will decide whether the Delmo Labor Homes are to be sold to the large planters or to the present occupants and other low-income farm families in southeast Missouri.

The sale of the Delmo Labor Homes to the people was made possible after hearings in Washington before the House Committee on Agriculture on the Hook bill, H. R. 3071. As an alternative to the attempt to get legislation through Congress, the committee, composed of Chairman W. R. Poage of Texas, Orville Zimmerman of Missouri, and Jerry Voorhis of California, proposed that the residents pool their money and with the support of a group of St. Louis financiers purchase all ten of the Delmo housing projects. Farm Security Administration agreed to postpone the sale date until August 23. In the meantime, the residents and other prospective buyers have been gathering their money, each family raising \$100 as a down payment. A non-profit corporation is about to be formed by Bishop William Scarlett and several business men in St. Louis.

Whether or not the tenants through the non-profit corporation will become home owners, depends on the officials of the Farm Security Administration. Will they decide to satisfy the powerful planter interests? Or will they consider the human value of the plan whereby the residents and others like them may purchase their homes and pay for them in five years?

You can aid by writing a letter to Mr. Frank Hancock, Administrator of Farm Security Administration, Washington, D. C., stating your desire to have the Delmo residents become home owners. The time is short, the opposition powerful and sometimes ruthless. Strike a blow for freedom now.

DAVID S. BURGESS
Independent Tenants Committee
Memphis, Tenn., July 31

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS
THE NATION, 20 Vesey St., New York 7, N. Y.
Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic:
One year \$5; Two years \$8; Three years \$11.
Additional Postage per year: Foreign, \$1;
Canadian, \$1. The Nation is indexed in Readers'
Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review
Digest, Index to Labor Articles, Public Affairs
Information Service, Dramatic Index. Three
weeks' notice and the old address as well as the
new are required for change of address.